

Application No.: 10/716,615

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached new sheet of drawing includes Fig. 7 which is submitted in response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings

Attachment: New Sheet

REMARKS

I. Introduction

At the time of the Office Action dated September 20, 2005, claims 1-13 were pending. Of those claims, claims 2, 4, 6-9, 12 and 14 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.142(b). Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication that claims 5 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this Amendment, claim 10 has been amended and new claim 14 has been added. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the amendment of claim 10 and new claim 14 can be found in, for example, Fig. 3 and relevant description of the specification.

The specification and drawings have also been amended in response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

Applicants also acknowledge, with appreciation, Examiner Cho's courtesy and professionalism in conducting an interview on January 19, 2006, during which the rejection of claims 1 and 10 as well as the objection to the drawings regarding claim 13 were discussed. It is Applicants' understanding that Examiner Cho would reconsider his position based on the following arguments, and a new figure (Fig. 7) is acceptable thereby overcoming the objection to the drawings.

II. Drawings

As mentioned above, the drawings have been objected to because a recitation in claim 13 is not shown in the drawings. As discussed in the interview, Fig. 7 has been submitted to show

the data processing unit (input buffer 1 and serial-parallel converter circuit 2) having power down signal input terminal NPD. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully solicited.

III. The Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Pradhan discloses a failsafe differential amplifier circuit identically corresponding to what is claimed.

During the interview, the following Examiner's positions were discussed. It is noted that the following discussions were not intended to define limitations recited in the pending claims.

First, the Examiner identified fail safe decision logic & control 310 as the claimed "processing unit," and LVDS receiver 304 and frequency detector logic 308 as the claimed "signal detection unit." Further, the Examiner asserted that signal AND from frequency detector logic 308 corresponds to the claimed "receive signal" and the "signal for controlling an operation of said processing unit."

In response, Applicants submit that the Examiner's position is unreasonable because signal AND should not have two different rolls: one is a signal to be processed by control 310; and another is a signal controlling the operation of control 310. Applicants emphasize that signal AND in Pradhan correspond to neither the "receive signal" nor the "signal for controlling an operation of said processing unit," recited in claim 1.

Second, the Examiner identified fail safe decision logic & control 310 as the claimed "processing unit," and LVDS receiver 304 and frequency detector logic 308 as the claimed "signal detection unit." Further, the Examiner asserted that signal xor from detector 306

corresponds to the claimed “received signal,” and signal AND from frequency detector logic 308 corresponds to the claimed “signal for controlling an operation of said processing unit.”

During the interview, Applicants invited the Examiner’s attention to claim 10, and explained that the Office Action pointed out that Pradhan’s detector 306 corresponds to the claimed offset buffer. As proposed in the interview, Applicants have amended claim 10 to recite that “said signal detection unit further comprising an offset buffer...” in this Amendment.

If the Examiner maintained his position on claim 10 despite the amendment of claim 10, detector 306 of Pradhan would be considered part of the “signal detection unit,” i.e., the combination of LVDS receiver 304 and frequency detector logic 308, which is identified as the claimed signal detection unit. If the Examiner’s asserted signal detection unit in Pradhan includes detector 306 in addition to LVDS receiver 304 and frequency detector logic 308, the Examiner’s position on claim 10 is inconsistent with that on claim 1. In more detail, the Examiner’s position on claim 1 in the interview is that signal xor from detector 306 corresponds to the claimed “received signal” which is processed by control 310. However, if detector 306 of Pradhan is assumed part of the “signal detection unit,” signal xor from detector 306 cannot be considered to correspond to the claimed “receive signal.” This is so because in claim 1, the signal detection unit is configured to provide the “signal for controlling an operation of said processing unit.”

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Pradhan does not disclose a receiver circuit including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102. Dependent claims 3, 10 and 11 are also patentably distinguishable over Pradhan at least because the claims respectively recite all the limitations recited in independent claim 1.

Application No.: 10/716,615

Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102, and favorable consideration thereof.

IV. New Claim 14

New claim 14 specifically recites that pull-up resistor and pull-down resistors are not included in the claimed receiver circuit. Applicants believe that a receiver circuit of claim 14 is not disclosed in Pradhan, and respectfully solicit favorable consideration of the claim.

V. Conclusion

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILZ & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida
Limited Recognition No. L0098

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TT
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 20, 2006
WDC99 1188291-1.060188.0713

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**